DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 459 JC 870 093

AUTHOR Rowh, Mark
TITLE Leadership for the Development Function in the Two-Year College.
INSTITUTION Greenville Technical Coll., S.C.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 12p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Community Colleges; Donors; Educational Finance; Financial Services; *Fund Raising; *Grantsmanship; Institutional Advancement; *Private Financial Support; Program Administration; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Identifying and obtaining external funding for two-year colleges require an approach which is consistent with the particular scope and mission of such institutions and which takes into consideration the priorities of funding agencies. Faced with divergent functions and financial/staffing constraints, two-year college development officers must not only serve as efficient managers, but also as effective leaders who can motivate other college personnel to support the resource development function. Resource development areas which require effective leadership include the following: (1) the provision of guidance to faculty and other staff in proposal development and other fund-raising strategies; (2) the establishment of practical goals and objectives for the resource development effort; (3) the appropriate use of consultants to save time and money, to make necessary contacts, and to lend credibility to a fund-raising effort; and (4) the development of communications processes to inform staff and faculty about grants and fund-raising projects and get them involved in proposal development and other efforts. The special constraints of fund raising at the two-year college level must be considered for effective leadership efforts to be undertaken. At the same time, it is also important to note the advantages involved, such as two-year institutions' openness to innovation and the development officer's ability to serve as a change agent within the institution. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278459

LEADERSHIP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT FUNCTION IN THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

Mark Rowh
Director of Planning and Grants
Greenville Technical College

JC 870 093

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark Rowh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

LEADERSHIP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT FUNCTION IN THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

Overview

The development function in the two-year college provides a challenging array of opportunities for educational leadership (for purposes of discussion here, "development" refers to educational fund raising and financial resource development). Professionals whose major responsibility is managing the resource development enterprise perform a vital role for two-year colleges. Not only do their efforts supply financial resources which would not otherwise be made available, but they also result in new programs and services which add vitality and innovation to the institutional setting. In these efforts, development officers' tasks as leaders can be facilitated through strategies specifically designed to improve efficiency, while broadening the base of involvement with other elements of the institution. Following are suggestions for effective leadership strategies in the resource development area.

Unique Considerations of Resource Development in the Two-Year College

Leadership strategies for identifying and obtaining external funding for two-year colleges require an approach which is consistent with the particular scope and mission of such institutions, and which takes into account their particular strengths and weakness vis-a-vis the priorities of funding agencies. Fund raising in most community, junior and technical colleges will differ in style and approach from that of other institutions. It is a significantly different enterprise than in the university setting, where research provides the impetus for most grant-seeking efforts; or from four-year colleges, which may rely heavily on alumni, foundation or other private funds; or from senior institutions in general, where such factors as athletics may contribute appreciably toward efforts to raise external funds. As Wise and Camper (1) point out:

> The very factors that make the two-year college unique create problems for fund raising. For example, because service areas for two-year colleges are usually restricted to a specific geographical area, this limits the number of sources from which two-year colleges can raise money. Another factor limiting fund raising is the population that two-year colleges serve. Two-year colleges serve a large number of minorities and low-income populations who traditionally have not had access to great wealth. These individuals are usually first-generation college-degree seekers.

At the same time, institutional resources devoted to fund raising efforts are frequently limited, particularly in terms of personnel. In many two-year colleges, resource development is assigned chiefly to one individual with little or no staff support other than a secretary. At the same time, it is not uncommon for the development officer to have other assigned duties which may or may not be directly related to resource development. A look at the current directory of the National Council for Resource Development (2), for example, reveals a diverse array of job titles, with responsibilities for development of grantsmanship combined with such various functions as affirmative action, planning, staff development, public relations and extension services.

With such diverse responsibilities, two-year college development officers are often faced with a difficult task. Regardless of divergent functions or financial or staffing constraints, they must provide leadership to the entire institution in the vital task of external resource development. In the process they must serve not only as efficient managers, but also as effective leaders who can motivate other personnel to support the resource development function.

Involving Faculty and Staff in Development Efforts

Possibly the most important factor in a successful development enterprise is the ability to involve faculty and other staff in proposal development and other fund raising strategies.

Because many two-year college faculty are inexperienced in proposal development, the development officer must be willing to take the lead not only in coordinating project development, but in guiding others through the process (see Frayer, 3). Of course some faculty and staff will be quite familiar with the process, but in that case leadership will still be necessary to insure that all efforts are consistent with institutional procedures and priorities.

The development officer must be willing to work on an individual basis with interested faculty and staff for some projects, while for others a task force format or similar group situation will be desirable during proposal design and project development. Similarly, coordinating with the chief academic officer and other administrators is essential. Through such coordination, it is sometimes possible to have individuals assigned to work on a grant proposal as a part of their work load. For instance, a faculty member who does not have a full teaching load because some of his classes did not make could be assigned to work in resource development a few hours a week for one term, or assigned to develop a specific proposal in lieu of teaching a class. This can be especially palatable to the academic administration if the potential pay-off is a grant or donation which will benefit the institution's academic program or the faculty as a whole.

Working effectively with other personnel in various departments can also be extremely useful. For instance, graphic artists can provide charts and graphs for use in proposals and

presentations. Business office staff can assist in budget development for grant proposals. Librarians can help with literature searches or data acquisition. Regardless of the size of the institution, there are certain to be personnel outside the limited organizational confines of the development office who can provide important help.

Planning and Goal-Setting

Another key area which requires effective leadership is the establishment of goals and objectives for the resource development effort. As Decker (4) points out, establishing internal goals and objectives is essential in the resource development enterprise. Given the preponderance of deadlines in the field, and the inherent pressures of trying to survive in the highly competitive fund raising environment, an effective goal-setting system is vital.

In the two-year college environment, it is essential that goal setting be practical. Too often, goal setting in the educational setting becomes a low priority task completed only in response to management directives. But what is necessary here is a personalized system of goals which can help the development officer provide institutional leadership while maintaining a high level of productivity. For example, targeting a specified number of grant applications to be completed per month can provide a useful framework for productivity. If monthly goals are met over a year's time, then beating that number in the following year can provide another personal incentive.

At the same time, external deadlines for proposal submission or other projects necessitate the establishment of related internal goals. For instance, the inflexible deadlines of federal grant programs do not allow for any variance. In the typical two-year college where there is limited staff assistance, a necessary methodology for survival is to establish a series of internal deadlines for portions or stages of proposal development. By working in pre-planned stages, unexpected contingencies can be managed, and crisis situations avoided.

Using Consultants

Leadership of development efforts can also be enhanced through the use of consultants. As Daniel (5) points out:

> Because we are unique in the higher education field, and because we are relatively young and inexperienced, we need to use consultants for specific and general purposes; specifically, when there is a particular thrust to be given to the Resource Development effort, such as in a capital campaign; generally when help is needed to mold into being the integrated model of college operation which will be addressed next. My experience has been that money spent for consultants is an investment which saves time--lots of time--and money--lots of money.

In addition to saving on resources, consultants often bring specific experiences and contacts to bear which can make a

significant difference in the chances for success of a grant proposal or private fund raising effort. They also can lend an air of extra credibility to a given fund raising effort, often an an important factor in generating internal support for the development function.

Attracting Internal Support

While it is desirable to foster the maximum level of productive work out of the development office, it is also important to look outward to the rest of the campus. After all, one or two persons can accomplish only so much. As mentioned earlier, much of the institution's fund raising success will be dependent on the development officer's ability to involve other personnel in resource development. Faculty and staff must understand what efforts are being undertaken, and how the results are benefiting them. Ultimately, of course, at least some of them must be actively involved in the actual process of proposal development or other fund raising efforts.

On one level, keeping staff and faculty involved in resource development can be as simple as merely distributing relevant information. Announcements of upcoming grant competitions, reports on grants or donations received by the institution, and overall progress reports on development activities--especially those which have directly benefited a department or individual not seen as a part of the "administration"--are well worth the effort of preparation and distribution. One easy way to maintain

visibility with this kind of detail is to publish a one or two-page newsletter on a regular basis, with a distinctive masthead and copies distributed to all personnel. Another is to maintain a system of "grant alerts," which can be brief notices of grant information targeted to specific individuals who might be interested.

On a more substantive basis, it is important to identify faculty and staff who are willing to become directly involved in proposal development, and then to work closely with them as the situation dictates. Some faculty in two-year colleges will be both willing and capable of taking the lead in developing a proposal; others will be willing but not yet capable; and still others amenable to working as part of a team, but in follow-up to the leadership of the development officer. Whatever the case, encouraging each individual's interest is vital to maintaining a development effort that is truly institutional in scope.

Conclusions

The special constraints of fund raising at the two-year college level must be considered for effective leadership efforts to be undertaken. At the same time, it is also important to note the advantages involved. First of all, two-year institutions are generally open to innovation and supportive of efforts to obtain outside funding. Too, the development officer is often in a position to do more than simply bring in additional funds, but also to serve as a kind of change agent by developing the framework for new programs and services of genuine importance to the institution.

It can be argued that few administrative positions in the two-year college offer a greater challenge to individual leadership ability than that of the resource development officer. At any rate, the unique demands of this enterprise certainly require a high level of professional commitment, along with a leadership approach tailored to the special challenges inherent in contemporary resource development.

Mark Rowh
Greenville Technical College
Greenville, South Carolina

SOURCES CITED

1. Wise, Stephen and Marlene Camper. "Fund Raising for Two-Year Colleges." In Public College and University Development.Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 1985, 131-140.

2. Membership Directory, National Council for Resource Development. Washington, DC, 1986.

3. Frayer, Dorothy. "The Faculty." In Grants: Views from the Campus. Edited by Kathryn Mohrman. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, 1979.

4. Decker, Virginia A. and Larry Decker. The Funding Process. Charlottesville, Virginia: Community Collaborators, 1979.

5. Daniel, David E. Future Trends in Resource Development. Washington, DC: National Council For Resource Development, 1985.

G4/5

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
MAR 20 1987